

www.bankcherokee.com

April 5,2004

Jennifer J. Johnson, Secretary Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System 20" Street and Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20551

Re: Docket No. R-1181 Proposed Revisions to the Community Reinvestment Act

Dear Ms. Johnson,

Cherokee State Bank. ("Bank"), a \$243 million bank with five branches located in St. Paul, Minnesota, welcomes this opportunity to provide comments on the proposal to amend regulations implementing the Community Reinvestment Act ("CRA"). Four of our branches are located in urban settings. Our flagship office and one branch are located in moderate-income census tracts. Another branch opened in 1994 in a Hispanic market, is located in a low-income census tract.

We are proud of our ninety-six year tradition of helping all the communities we serve to grow and prosper. We have always seen our success tied to the success of the communities we serve.

We strongly support the proposal to increase the asset **size** from \$250 million to \$500 million for banks to be eligible for the small bank streamlined CRA examination. In fact, we would like to see the agencies consider the threshold be increased to 1 billion. Our comments will focus on the costs of the regulatory burden, the ability to compete and examination resource allocation. First we would like to include a few **remarks** taken directly from a speech delivered by **FDIC** Chairman Donald E. Powell to the National Association for Business Economics on March 26,2004. He speaks to the trends of community bank consolidation and defines community banks as those that "typically have less than one billion dollars in assets". His remarks follow:

"The story of banking in the U.S. is fast becoming a tale of two industries. At one end are the dozen or so large complex banking organizations whose size is measured in the hundreds of billions. Some have assets in the range of one trillion dollars in assets. At the other end are thousands of community banks, which typically have less than one billion dollars in assets.

607 South Smith Avenue 985 Grand Avenue 675 Randolph Avenue 175 Concord Street 999 Village Center Drive

Two data points help convey the scale of this transformation. Since 1985 the number of community banks declined by half, from over 14,000 to just over 7,000 today. In 1985, the top ten banking organizations held 16% of industry deposits. Today their share is

This consolidation trend suggests the largest institutions may grow even larger and community banks will continue to decline in number. We could well see a banking industry with a few institutions having assets in the trillions of dollars, and perhaps only half as many community banks as we have today."

Costs of regulatory burden

Under the current rules, Cherokee State Bank will begin data collecting on January 1, 2006. The **Bank** is already **planning** a nine month lead time beginning in **April**, 2005 to create the systems, procedures, controls, and the needed training to be in place before the deadline. All of this will take resources. The collection and reporting are complex requirements with many subtle nuances. The end product, just as with HMDA data and reporting, must be accurate. It will take quality processes and procedures and then scrubbing and re-scrubbing of the data to ensure data quality. The data quality is Critical bccause at exam time community banks are held to the same standard as the large multibillion dollar regional banks with which they compete. Large bank CRA data collection and reporting comes at a significant cost; surely those dollars could be better spent adding new loans, products and services to the local communities we serve.

Ability to compete

We find it ironic that community groups seem oblivious to the costs associated with items like the large bank CRA data collection and reporting requirements, yet these groups decry the bank mergers that eliminate local banks from the community. They want the local decision makers with a vested interest in the success of the community, not soine making decisions five states away. Community groups cannot have it both ways. They are missing the direct connection between the ability of the community banks to comply with the ever-growing regulatory burden and at the same time compete against the large institutions. The large institutions can more effectively manage the regulatory burden by developing processes and procedures and then spreading the development costs across many banks. Standard forms, centralized processing and strong internal controls that not **only** create additional efficiencies, but result in a uniform, **high** standard end product. community banks, while being held by examiners to the same high standards for the end product, do not share the luxury of spreading the costs and creating those same large bank efficiencies. For us, the implementing and ongoing costs for the regulatory burden come from just one source, our bottom liue. One of the reasons that the bank consolidation trend that Mr. Powell's refers to will continue is the inability of community banks to absorb the costs associated with the ever-growing and complex regulatory burden. The *large* bank CRA data collection and reporting requirements are **examples** of the ever **growing**, complex and costly regulatory burden for "small" community banks.

The Large Bank CRA Investment Test is mother area where most community banks cannot compete and is clearly skewed towards truly large institutions. Three multistate/multi billion dollar banks- Wells Fargo, US Bank and TCF dominate the Minneapolis/St. Paul MSA. The challenges of competing with them for qualified investments in this market are daunting at best. Although the Investment Test performance criteria guidance contained with the regulation encourage investments that are "responsive" and "innovative", as we move towards large bank CRA in 2006 we are bracing for an investment arena that will be "unavailable" and "in Fargo".

Examination resource allocation

We believe the regulatory agencies will have a strong interest in seeing an increase for what asset size constitutes a large bank, It is a continual challenge to not only develop a staff with CRA expertise, but also meet the maximum time deadlines between CRA exams. The small bank streamlined examination process is much simpler for examiners, yet it accomplishes the goals of the CRA. By not increasing the threshold to \$500 million more banks will be subject to the more complex large bank exam. From a risk standpoint, one has to question if spending numerous hours analyzing complex loan and community data and then writing a carefully worded report for a community bank is the best use of agency resources. It would be interesting to know if the agencies have analyzed the cost savings to the examination process if the large bank threshold is increased from \$250 to \$500 million (affecting approximately 1100 banks). The savings has to be significant.

The proposal to increase the large bank threshold to at least \$500 million is an example of legislators, regulators, other firancial institutions and community groups working to forge a more effective, yet fair, approach to the goals of the CRA. For legislators, the proposal ensures that the spirit and intent of the CRA remain intact. For regulators, the proposal allows them to reallocate examination assets to better match risk, schedules and examiner expertise. And finally, for both banks and consumer groups, the reduced costs of regulatory burden will assist with the continued viability of community banks and also add resources back to the community in the form of new loans, products and services.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our views on this important proposal.

Sincerely,

Heidi R. Gesell

President and CEO

William J. Patient CRA and Compliance Officer